

Remarks/Arguments

Amendments to the Claims

Amendments to Claim 1 are supported by figures, especially Figures 1, 2, and 5-7. In particular Figures 3 and 4, cross-sections of the case, show the flat annular shape of flange 20. The specification also supports the amendments, particularly paragraphs [0012] and [0013]. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

New Claim 6

Claim 6 substantially recites the elements of original Claims 1 and 2. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

The Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,678,014 (Owen et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Anticipation requires that all of the elements of the claim be taught within the four corners of a single reference.

Claim 1

Owen does not teach a flat annular ring

Amended Claim 1 recites: “said flange comprising a flat annular ring...” The Examiner has asserted that connector 149 and projection 149’ of Owen form a flange. Assuming *arguendo* that this is the case, the “flange” formed by 149 and 149’ does not comprise the flat annular ring recited in Claim 1. The flange recited in Claim 1 is a uniformly flat, circular surface as shown in Figures 1, 3, and 4 of the present application. That is, the inner circumference of the flange and the outer circumference of the flange are in the same flat plane. Figures 3 and 4 of the present application clearly show that the cross-section of the flange is flat, that is, there is no outer lip, projection, or other deviation from the plane of the annular ring. In Owen, a narrow lip formed by connector 149 and projection 149’ surrounds an opening. However, assuming *arguendo* that

the lip is analogous to the annular ring recited in Claim 1, it is clear that the lip does not form a flat annular ring. Specifically, the portion of the lip formed by projection 149' juts above the portion of the lip formed by connection 149. The lip does not form a flat annular ring.

Owen does not teach a flange forming a seal with a valve

Amended Claim 1 recites: "... a flat annular ring operatively arranged to form a seal with said valve" Applicant has shown that the lip of Owen does not anticipate the flat annular ring recited in Claim 1, at least since the lip is not flat. However, assuming *arguendo* that the lip formed by connector 149 and projection 149' is analogous to the ring recited in Claim 1, the lip does not form a seal with the valve. Owen teaches that only a portion of the lip (the tip of projection 149') touches a surface of the valve (the flap for the valve). Even if Owen's lip were flat, it could not form a seal with the flap, since the flap is hinged and only the portion of the lip near the hinge would be in contact with the flap. It is clear from Figure 8 of Owen that any seal between 149/149' and the item being inflated/deflated must be made by the outside surface of the cylinder formed by 149 and the inside cylindrical surface of F.V.

Owen does not teach all the elements of Claim 1. Therefore, Owen does not anticipate Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be removed.

New Claim 6

New Claim 6 recites the elements of original Claims 1 and 2. The Examiner has stated that Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. This is accomplished by Claim 6. Therefore, Claim 6 is novel with respect to Owen.

Rejection of Claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,678,014 (Owen et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,560 (Yan).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Also, the

prior art references cited by the Examiner must teach or suggest the claim limitations of the subject invention.

Owen does not teach or suggest all the elements of Claim 1

As shown above, Owen does not teach or suggest all the elements of Claim 1. Yan does not cure the defects of Owen. Yan teaches a battery charger and is silent regarding a flange as recited in Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Owen in view of Yan. Claims 3-5, dependent from Claim 1, also are patentable over the cited references. Applicant requests that the rejections be removed.

The Objection of Claim 2 as Being Dependent Upon a Rejected Base Claim

Claim 2 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that this claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has shown that Claim 1 is novel with respect to the cited prior art. Therefore, Claim 2, dependent from Claim 1, also is novel with respect to the cited prior art. Applicant requests that the objection to Claim 2 be removed.

Attorney Docket No. KEYP:120US
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/605,711
Reply to Final Office Action dated: January 7, 2005
Dated: May 6, 2005

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,



C. Paul Maliszewski
Registration No. 51,990
CUSTOMER NO. 24041
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406
Telephone No. 716-626-1564

Dated: May 6, 2005
CPM/